

## REMARKS

### **I. THE “REQUIRMENT” FOR FUNCTIONALITY WAS DISCLOSED IN THE SPECIFICATION WHEN ORIGINALLY FILED, THUS THE §§ 112 REJECTION AND 132(a) OBJECTION CANNOT BE SUSTAINED**

In his determination, the Examiner found that the claimed subject matter was not fully supported by the specification. On March 27, 2006, the Examiner was contacted by phone to further clarify the objection and rejection based on added material not supported by the original disclosure (e.g. “the requirement of functionality is never recited in the specification.”) *Office Action, p. 2 and 4*. The Examiner clarified that he did not find support in the specification for the various functionalities found in the identified claims.

The Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s determination. On page 11, ln 23-25, the specification states, “[t]he SA agreement requires the sending node to share information with the receiving node about the type of cryptographic method, the algorithm, and the keys used in the encryption process.” Further, on page 13, ln 18-20, the specification states, “[t]he security scheme in the present invention covers one or more portions of the public network as mandated by the needs of the user and the level of security desired.” Applicants respectfully suggest that these two cited sections of the specification support the ““requirement of functionality” limitations found in Claims 1-4, 8-14, and 17-20, and believe that this rejection and objection cannot be sustained in light of the identified support in the specification based on the use of the “requiring” and “mandated” terminology.

### **II. THE CITED REFERENCE CANNOT SUSTAIN A §103 REJECTION OF THE AMENDED CLAIMS**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over the Calhoun reference in view of the ‘908 Patent. Applicants respectfully suggests that the amended claims overcome the § 103(a) rejection.

The claims have been amended to clearly specify that the broker and AAA server are separate entities with distinguishable functions. Claims 1 and 11 and each of their dependent

claims require a service level agreement broker that establishes and maintains, or supports the establishment and maintenance, of a plurality of security associations. Claim 20 and each of its dependent claims require a broker functioning as a consortium of a plurality of security associations that are used to establish security associations, and Claim 29 and each of its dependent claims requires a broker supporting a plurality of security associations used to establish a security association between the home network and the mobile node. Each of the claims also requires a separate AAA server performing authentication and accounting functions. Calhoun and the '908 Patent, alone or in combination, do not disclose, suggest, or teach two separate AAA server and broker entities, nor do the two references disclose, suggest, or teach a broker or other entity performing the claimed functions.

The disclosed message flow of the DIAMETER protocol in Calhoun [Section 4.1, p. 23] fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the message flow shown in Figure 2 of the application and as claimed. The message flow in Section 4.1, p. 23 shows how the DIAMETER Mobile IP Extensions identified in Section 3.5, 3.8, and 3.11 can be used. This server-to-server communication protocol and message flow in the Calhoun reference actually teaches away from the single registration message claimed in Claims 1, 11, 20, and 29. Multiple messages are required for a communication between the mobile node and the home network (e.g. Reg-Req, an AMR, a HAR, a HAA, an AMA, and a Reg-Reply) in Calhoun, versus the single request and single reply message claimed in the invention, which is also not restricted at any point by a server-to-server specific communication protocol. This claimed simplified and improved message flow offers a significant reduction in message overhead over the communication links, improving efficiency, reducing latency, and increasing reliability compared to the Calhoun reference message flow.

Further, it is respectfully suggested that the Calhoun and '908 Patent do not combine to teach a security gateway organized by incorporating the AAA server and the firewall functions. Combining the AAA server and firewall functions as claimed to function as a security gateway

that both blocks access and does authentication and accounting functions to track communications would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed. The combined references do not suggest combining the two functions in that manner as an integrated security gateway entity.

Finally, in this Office Action the Examiner failed to consider the requirement of functionality limitations for Claims 1-4, 8-14, and 17-20 added to the Claims in Applicant's previous response based on an alleged lack of support in the original specification. As discussed above, the specification does support the limitation of requiring the specified functionality. It is believed that when properly considered, independent Claims 1, 11, 20, and 29 are further distinguishable from the Calhoun reference based on the requirement limitation, because Calhoun does not teach, suggest, or disclose requiring the specified functions for secure communication.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

The amended claims are distinguishable from the teachings of the Calhoun and '908 Patent references. The Applicants believe that the amended claims traverse the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 103(a) rejections and § 132 objections. The specification does support the "requiring" functionality limitations, and those claimed limitations are not taught, suggested, or disclosed by the two cited references. The two separate broker and AAA server entities are also not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the two references, nor are the claimed functions for the claimed broker. It is also not believed that the two references combine to teach the single security gateway entity incorporating both AAA server and firewall functions. Finally, the message flow of the claimed invention is very different from that in Calhoun, offering a simplified and improved message flow with significant improved efficiency and increased reliability. Since the dependent claims add further limitations to the allowable independent claims, the Applicants believe the dependent claims are likewise allowable.

Accordingly, pending claims 1-37 are believed allowable because the claimed invention is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references. It is believed that no additional fees are necessary for this filing. If additional fees are required for filing this response, then the appropriate fees should be deducted from D. Scott Hemingway's Deposit Account No. 501,270.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Malcolm W. Pipes". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Malcolm W. Pipes  
Reg. No. 46,995  
Attorney for Applicant

Hemingway & Hansen, LLP  
460 Preston Common West  
8117 Preston Road  
Dallas, Texas 75225  
(214)292-8301 (voice)  
(214)739-5209 (fax)